

### **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-38 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 13, 23 and 34 being independent. Claims 1, 5-13, 16, 17, 19-23 27, 28, 30-34, 37, and 38 are amended herein. No claims are canceled or withdrawn.

### **§ 102 REJECTIONS**

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 22-25, 27, 29-31, 33-35 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lortz (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,610; hereafter “Lortz”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other things, determining whether to authorize the operation as a function of whether the *client* user has been delegated administrative authority by a *server* administrator to perform the operation with respect to the resource, the administrative authority being independent of whether the client user is a member of an administrators group associated with any resource of the server.

Lortz, on the other hand, does not disclose these limitations. Instead, Lortz discloses an authorization system 10 that includes clients 12a-12n where each

client, such as 12a, can delegate its own authorization credentials to a second client (see FIG. 1 and col. 2, lines 10-14 of Lortz). However, one client user delegating its own authorization credentials to another client user, as taught by Lortz, is entirely different from a *server administrator* delegating administrative authority to a *client* user, as in claim 1. It is acknowledged in the Office Action that the only delegating in Lortz is between one client user and another client user, not between a *server administrator* and a client user (see pp. 2-3 of the Office Action). In fact, after reviewing Lortz in its entirety, Applicant is unable to find any mention of a server administrator delegating administrative authority to a client user, let alone delegating administrative authority that is independent of whether the client user is a member of an administrative group.

Therefore, Lortz fails to disclose or even suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is distinguishable over Lortz.

Independent claims 13, 23, and 34 include recitations similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 13, 23, and 34 are patentable over Lortz for at least the same reasons.

Dependent claims 2-3, 5, 7-10, 12, 14, 16, 18-20, 22, 24-25, 27, 29-31, 33, 35, and 38 depend from claims 1, 13, 23, and 34, respectively and are distinguishable over Lortz by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite.

### **§ 103 REJECTIONS**

Claims 4, 6, 11, 15, 17, 21, 26, 28, 32 and 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,610; hereafter “Lortz”) in view of Krishnan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,856; hereafter “Krishnan”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Dependent claims 4, 6, 11, 15, 17, 21, 26, 28, 32 and 36-37 are distinguishable over the proposed combination of references by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 1, 13, 23 and 34, as well as for additional features that they recite. Krishnan fails to cure the deficiencies of Lortz. In addition, there is no motivation to combine the Lortz and Krishnan references. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

**CONCLUSION**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. However, if there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: 03/19/2009\_\_\_\_\_

By: /Robert C. Peck/\_\_\_\_\_

David S. Lee  
Reg. No. 38222  
Robert C. Peck  
Reg No. 56826  
206-876-6019